

September 27, 2010

Ms. Rebecca Brewer Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C. P.O. Box 1210 McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2010-14637

Dear Ms. Brewer:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 399443.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for documentation from specified dates regarding the legal determination that a specified petition was not valid. You claim the submitted information, which is dated June 4, 2010, is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information within the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676

¹Although you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and with the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). In this instance, however, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503, and section 552.111, rather than rule 192.5. ORD 676 at 3.

at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. Id. at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers* Ins. Exch., 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App. — Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorneyclient privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, id. 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." Id. 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the submitted information consists of communications between city employees, a city attorney, and special counsel for the city that were made for the purpose of rendering legal services. You explain that these communications were intended to be confidential, and that confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree this information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that the city may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php,

or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Ramara A Holland

Tamara H. Holland Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

THH/em

Ref: ID# 399443

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor (w/o enclosures)